

2008 196-E

196545

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorelee Donath [mailto:donathl@carcosa.net]
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2008 11:47 AM
To: Chairman.Fleming
Subject: Public Testimony

Dec. 12, 2008

Elizabeth B. Fleming, Chairman
Public Service Commission of South Carolina,
101 Executive Center Dr., Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Madam Chairman,

I would like to congratulate you and the other Commission members on the way in which you have run the hearings on SCE&G's proposal to raise rates and build two new nuclear reactors in Jenkinsville. I attended a hearing earlier in the fall and was also able to attend last week. In particular, I want to applaud the attention you have given to input from citizens and the forums you put in place for this purpose. I was very impressed that on Wed. Dec. 5 you extended the public comment period until 8:00 pm so that everyone might be heard.

I hadn't anticipated this, and I am very glad everyone present was able to give their testimony. Unfortunately, I had to leave that day at 6:00 pm because my husband was stranded with a flat on his 5-mile bicycle commute. I wish I had returned to the hearing to give my comments.

I would like to ask you to include my brief comments in the public record, although I was not present when you called my name. I have included them below.

Thank you for representing the public good.

Sincerely,

Lori Donath
4343 Mountain Dr.
Columbia, SC 29203
803-254-4743

Representatives of SCE&G have tried to position their proposal as necessary and inevitable, but they have not provided evidence to support this. They haven't shown that building new nuclear reactors is necessary, and this proposal certainly is not inevitable. They haven't demonstrated that they have attempted or even considered various conservative approaches to energy use and supply, including peak load management, incentives for insulation, general conservation, and proven technologies such as solar and wind power. Moreover, the representatives have not shown that they have adequately researched the environmental and human impact of building two new nuclear reactors. In addition to my misgivings about a purported completed project, I and my fellow citizens

have no guarantee that the proposed project would ever see completion to supply our energy needs; instead we might just be breaking our backs supporting higher rates in order to line the pockets of the SCE&G top tier with a larger profit margin.

Rather than the merit of the proposal (relative to the public benefit) the discourse of these hearings seems to have shifted the burden of responsibility for persuasive evidence onto ratepayers, citizens, and civic-minded organizations who must then lay out why the proposal is not desirable.

But SCE&G has not sufficiently made its case that it will act in service to the public. As a ratepayer and a citizen I am not willing to subsidize SCE&G with a blank check for a proposal that has not been demonstrated to benefit me or my fellow citizens in the short term, certainly, and neither in the long term--the future we are building for our children with every decision we make.